DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 816 UD 013 015

AUTHOR	Triandis, Harry C.; And Others
TITLE	Role Perceptions Among Black and White Adolescents and the Hardcore Unemployed. Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged Series, Technical Report Number 6.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISED-TR-6
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Caucasian Students; College Students; Cultural Factors; Economically Disadvantaged; Ghettos; *Negro Youth; Research Methodology; *Role Perception; Socioeconomic Status; *Unemployed; Urban Culture; *Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois; Missouri

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study was directed at an examination of role perceptions among four groups of subjects, two white and two black. The black samples are composed of adult hardcore unemployed men and adolescent boys in a special high school training program. One of the white samples also consisted of adolescents in the same program; the other was constituted from the subject pool of the University of Illinois and includes middle-class college girls. The study was undertaken with the expectation that some of the cross-cultural similarities observed in previous studies would be replicated, but also that much would be learned about the unique ways of role perception within subcultures of the United States. Role behaviors were elicited from members of the subject population by means of an open-ended questionnaire. Stimulus role pairs were obtained by random selection from a list of 27 stimulus persons used in previous research. Each subject was asked to write three behaviors which could occur between the two persons listed. A total of 21 such pairs was used. As in previous research elicitation, questionnaires were "decentered" by asking five black consultants to translate them into "Black English" and back again. The major advantage of the decentered version in standard English is that it contains mostly words that are familiar to ghetto blacks. (Author/JM)

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

ROLE PERCEPTIONS AMONG BLACK AND WHITE ADOLESCENTS AND THE HARDCORE UNEMPLOYED

Harry C. Triandis, Jack M. Feldman
University of Illinois

and

William M. Harvey
St. Louis Narcotics Service Council

Technical Report No. 6

February, 1971

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant No. 12-P-55175/5-02

from the Social and Rehabilitation Service

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Washington, D. C., 20201

Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigator

Preface

This report is part of a series which will be concerned with the economically disadvantaged. We plan to test the assumption that economic disadvantages create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment. We call such characteristic perceptions the "subjective culture" of a particular group. We expect to find characteristic differences in the subjective cultures of blacks and whites who differ in level of economic advantage. We suspect that such differences in subjective culture lead to major barriers in communication between an employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees and his subordinates. Our plan is to determine the differences in subjective culture by employing a battery of newly developed procedures, tailormade to detect cultural differences; we then plan to incorporate this information in specially designed training programs; finally, we hope to test the effectiveness of these training programs by examining the effects of training on measures of occupational stability.

The present report is the second of four reports that examine the characteristic ways of perceiving the social environment of economically disadvantaged white and black young males and hardcore unemployed blacks. Our comparison group consists of college girls. Our major concern here is to get at the contrast that black and white comparisons are likely to provide. Thus, we look only at differences in which the white boys and girls agree on the one hand, and the two black samples agree with each other, on the other hand. It should be stressed here that our sampling has been deliberately most selective: our blacks are not ordinary blacks, but black males with vocational problems; our whites are most heterogeneous. We want to generalize to that situation in which black males with vocational problems try to become integrated in a highly heterogeneous white establishment.

This report is concerned with role perception. The next reports will deal with job perceptions and the perceptions of the connections between what one does and what one gets from his social environment. Other reports which will come in about a year will explore the generality and implications of our findings for cross-cultural training and for intercultural harmony.

Harry C. Triandis

ROLE PERCEPTIONS AMONG BLACK AND WHITE ADOLESCENTS AND THE HARDCORE UNEMPLOYED[1]

Harry C. Triandis, Jack M. Feldman
University of Illinois

and

William M. Harvey
St. Louis Narcotics Service Council

A role is a patterned sequence of learned behaviors performed by a person in an interaction situation (Sarbin, 1954). This pattern of behaviors is normative in the sense that it is particularly appropriate for persons holding specific positions in a social system. From the early use of the role concept (Linton, 1936) it has been recognized that it refers to a dynamic or action component of the status of an individual in a social system. Recent use of the concept of role is very extensive, as can be seen from the 1,400 bibliography in Biddle and Thomas' (1966) review. Role theory is a major theoretical perspective in social psychology (Sarbin & Allen, 1968).

Among the more extensive investigations of role perceptions published in recent years, Triandis, Vassiliou and Nassiakou (1968) reported similarities and differences in the perception of about 100 roles among Americans and Greeks. Banton (1965) reviewed roles from an anthropological perspective. Triandis, McGuire, Saral, Yang, Loh and Vassiliou (1971) compared role perceptions among Americans, Indians, Taiwanese, Peruvians and Greeks.

---

[1]The research reported here was supported by the Social and Rehabilitation Services of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Research Grant No. 12-P-55175/5-02. We are deeply grateful to Michael Ross and Kenneth Weaver who supervised data collection in two of our samples. They were assisted by Chet Brown, Henry F. Davis, William Gardner, Caleb Johnson, Jr., Don Leach, Allen Long, Herman Standberry and Joseph Takash. We also wish to thank James Savage for his critical comments of an earlier version of this report.

Such investigations have revealed that a set of basic dimensions of social behavior are cross-culturally general. Each role includes three attributes: (a) giving or denying affect; (b) giving or denying status; and (c) intimacy-formality. These broad cross-culturally common dimensions of role perception can be conceived as genotypes of role perception. In particular cultures these genotypes appear in various forms. Thus, for instance, the giving of affect dimension may be expressed in one culture as nurturance (take care of, love, help) and in another culture as love (appoint, love, fall in love with). In addition to such differences in role perception, there are major differences in the degree to which a particular role is perceived as having more or less of the three culture-common attributes (affect, status, intimacy) and in the presence of culture unique attributes.

The present paper is an exploratory study directed at an examination of role perceptions among four groups of subjects, two white and two black. The black samples are composed of adult hardcore unemployed men and adolescent boys in a special high school training program. One of the white samples also consisted of adolescents in the same program. The other was constituted from the subject pool of the University of Illinois and includes middle-class college girls. The study was undertaken with the expectation that some of the cross-cultural similarities observed in previous studies will be reflected in the present study, but also much will be learned about the unique ways of role perception within subcultures of the United States. We have employed a meta-theoretical posture described by Triandis and Malpass (1970) which is in the tradition of Brunswickian probabilistic functionalism, which essentially demands that studies of perception provide for an adequate representation of the events that occur naturally in human environments. The basic notion is to have an open mind, sample properly and observe both similarities and differences in perception among various kinds of subjects, much as a naturalist examines his subject matter.

Method

Subject Population

This study had two main goals: (a) instrument development and (b) the gathering of data on subjective culture--that is, the typical ways in which the samples tested perceive their social environment. To reach these goals it was desirable that as many disparate samples as possible should be used. This heterogeneity is meant to insure the external validity of the subjective culture data and to provide intersubject variance for instrument development.

It was possible to obtain four geographically and demographically distinct samples:

(1) White female college students, who filled out the questionnaire as part of a course requirement in an introductory psychology course. (White females were used because the investigators felt that they are the best examples of carriers of white middle-class culture, and thus would provide an "extreme-groups" comparison to the black samples.)

(2) Black working-class and lower-class high school boys from the Chicago Heights area (a southern suburb of Chicago).

(3) White high school boys, working-class and lower-class, and some Spanish-speaking adult males from Chicago Heights.

(4) Black adult subjects, classified as "hardcore unemployed," from St. Louis, Missouri.

No attempt was made to have the same person respond to all the questionnaires. A major reason for this was that the questionnaires required as much as 15 hours of testing time (for some subjects). Thus, for each sample we established a pool of subjects out of which we drew the subjects that answered each particular questionnaire.

The white girls were approximately 19 years old, practically all of them unmarried, most of them from various parts of Illinois, including farms and other rural areas, with family backgrounds characteristic of the middle class. The pool from which we drew had 83 girls.

The white boys were on the average a year younger than the white girls. A pool of 43 young men, in their late teens or early twenties, was established from among those who were in a pre-vocational work adjustment training program at a high school in the outskirts of Chicago, Illinois. The high school considered these men socially maladjusted, but their I.Qs were in the normal or high range. The maladjustment may have been related to factors such as cultural deprivation, educational retardation, inadequate school opportunities, or parental mobility which did not allow the young men to stay in school for sufficiently long periods of time. One quarter to one-third of these subjects were expected by school authorities to be hardcore-unemployed, unless some drastic retraining was made available to them. As a result they were in the Man Power Development Training Program of their high school, learning skills such as welding, auto mechanics and machine operation. Another quarter was referred to the Illinois Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, because of "adjustment problems." Finally, another quarter consisted of Spanish Americans who had language and cultural adjustment difficulties. They were in the training programs in order to acquire skills which would lead to employment.

The black high school subjects were drawn from a pool of 60 males, who were in the same program at the same high school as the white boys described in the previous paragraph. Their ages ranged from 15-21, with a mean of about 16 and a half. About 20 of the 60 responded to five of the six questionnaires. Thus, there is a tendency for the subjects with better

working habits (in the sense that they were willing and able to return several times to the test sessions) to be over-represented in this sample. The subjects were typical of the blacks found in "suburban ghettoes," such as one finds in the outskirts of large cities. Some of their parents were middle class, but most came from homes in which the mother was the major income-maker, and where the income levels were very low. The students were classified as maladjusted because of gambling, drinking, sexual problems or drug abuse. Most of these subjects had police records. All were in the normal I. Q. range, and some even aspired to go to college. The training they received in the special programs was identical to that of the white boys described in the previous paragraph.

The black hardcore came from a pool of males, from the inner city in St. Louis, Missouri. They were on the average 26 years old, had a history of unemployment, drug abuse and most of them had police records.

Table 1 presents further biographical details of the subject population. The table indicates that the samples differ on education, age, and plans for the future, in addition to the obvious differences in race and sex. These additional differences must be kept in mind when interpreting the data. The design of this study specified data collection from 20 college girls and 40 of each of the other groups, but due to problems in obtaining subjects, the actual N is 119.

Questionnaire Development

Role behaviors were elicited from members of the subject population, described above, by means of an open-ended questionnaire. Stimulus role pairs were obtained by random selection from a list of 27 stimulus persons used in previous research (Triandis, Feldman & Harvey, 1970). Each subject

Table 1

Discriminant Analysis on Biographical Data by Demographic Group

Group Means on Original Variables

Group	Age	Marital Status	Life in Town	Where Lived	Grade in School	Plans for Future	Family Income	Social Class
White college girls	18.75	0.00	.13	2.25	3.69	2.38	4.06	2.94
White high school & Spanish students	18.18	.09	.41	1.59	2.05	1.50	3.77	2.41
Black high school students	16.39	.04	.57	1.57	2.00	1.48	3.30	2.39
Black hardcore	26.67	.38	.75	1.54	2.29	.71	2.71	2.33

Scaled Vectors of Discriminant Functions

Variables	Function 1	Function 2
Age	2.37	6.86
Marital Status	1.04	-.34
Life in town	2.53	-1.09
Where lived	.46	.11
Grade in school	-3.37	5.10
Future plans	-2.40	.85
Family income	-.37	-.81
Social class	1.02	2.27
% of variance	66.11	31.11

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
White college girls	-1.36	7.75
White high school & Spanish students	.01	5.86
Black high school students	.01	5.46
Black hardcore	1.07	7.58

Overall F ratio = 9.06, (df = 24,215) $p < .01$.

was asked to write three behaviors which could occur between the two persons listed. A total of of 21 such pairs was used.[2]

As in previous research (Triandis et al, 1970) elicitation questionnaires were "decentered" (Werner & Campbell, 1970) by asking five black consultants[3] to translate them into "Black English" and back again. This decentering procedure is used in cross-cultural research, and allows for the development of translation equivalent versions of a written text. The method begins with a text in language A, which is translated into language B. A different group of bilinguals translates B back to A', and a comparison between A and A' leads to a modification of A, to become simpler and more easily translatable into B. The new version of A, which might be designated as A'', is then translated into B, and the new version of B' is back translated into A'''. When changes have been made in such a way as to reclaim the original text, e.g., A''' = A'''', the two versions A''' and B''' are used in the research project. In our case, however, it was decided to utilize a decentered version in standard English, on the grounds that (a) our subjects did understand standard English, and (b) black English is an oral language, and the presentation of a questionnaire in black English would look "phony" to our black subjects. The major advantage of the decentered version in standard English is that it contains mostly words that are familiar to ghetto blacks,

---

[2]The St. Louis population is an exception to this. A group of drug addicts at a Narcotics Rehabilitation Center (NASCO, Inc.) participated in a group discussion of each stimulus person, which was tape recorded and later transcribed.

[3]These consultants were black students in the University's Special Educational Opportunities Program (SEOP), who consulted in many phases of the research.

and a style which is sufficiently simple to permit translation into black ways of encoding reality. At the same time, the decentered version is perfectly suitable for use with middle-class subjects, so that all subjects did respond to the same questionnaires.

Responses to the elicitation questionnaires were tabulated separately for each population. Twenty items were selected for inclusion in the final questionnaire, roughly corresponding to the three basic dimensions of social behavior discovered by Triandis et al (1971). These items were the most frequent, across role-pairs in each of the four populations. The items themselves were "decentered" in order to prevent misunderstandings in the less-educated subject populations.[4]

Role pairs were developed according to a formula devised by the first and second authors. Examples of roles falling in each cell of a quasi-factorial design were selected. The cells were defined by the factors ingroup-outgroup, family vs. secondary group within the ingroup factor, cooperation vs. conflict roles within the outgroup factor, roles with and without clearly defined norms within each of these categories, and finally crossing all of these categories, high to low status, equal status, and low to high status categories. In addition, each ingroup role pair was presented to subjects in each of two situations, one public (a park, for family roles; a party, for secondary group roles), one private (in the house, for family roles; at work, for secondary group roles), outgroup role pairs were presented both at city hall (formal) and at a park (informal), because it was felt that outgroup interactions do not generally take place in private. A total of 104 role stimuli were used.

---

[4]See the appropriate tables in the Results section for a list of items and stimuli.

Procedure

Because the questionnaire administrators had reported some difficulty in reading the instructions on the part of the non-college samples, orally administered instructions were prepared. These instructions were decentered in the same manner as the elicitation instructions. Subjects were asked to write a number from 0 to 9 in the space next to each word or phrase under a given role pair, corresponding to the likelihood that the first person would do that behavior to or with the second person in that setting. Each number was labelled with a descriptive word or phrase. The scale from 0 to 9 and the corresponding labels were reproduced at the bottom of each page. A single role pair appeared on a page and the 104 pages were assembled in three random orders, coded by color. The questionnaire was in two parts, administered in two sessions, and each subject answered a part II of the same color as his part I. Arbitrary numbers were given to each subject to assure continuity across testing sessions. Item order was the same on each page. A biographical data sheet, asking the subject's age, marital status, education, family income, and social class identification, was included in every questionnaire. A "practice sheet," described below, was administered to each subject before he responded to the actual instrument.

The 0 to 9 scale format was selected to partially control response bias and/or careless responding on the subject's part. It was felt that having the subject select and write a number next to each alternative would force increased attention to the task, as opposed to simply asking for check marks on a graphic scale.

The "practice sheet" for each task served two purposes. It familiarized the subject with the task, and allowed questionnaire administrators to check the subject's comprehension of the rating task. The practice sheets consisted

of simplified versions of the rating task with obvious answers. Questionnaire administrators received a sheet with criteria for answering. If a subject's answers did not correspond to the criteria, the administrator questionned him as to why he had answered in that way. If the subject's answer showed that he understood the task, but had different ideas about the ratings than the criteria would indicate, he was allowed to continue. If he could not explain his ratings, and the administrator's repeated instructions could not produce understanding, the subject was excused. Approximately 10% of the black samples were excused.

Administration

Both the elicitation questionnaires and the structured instruments were administered by locally employed assistants of the same race and sex as the subjects, except for the college student sample. College student questionnaires were administered by the second author. In Chicago Heights, employees of the State Vocational Rehabilitation Service administered questionnaires to white and Spanish-speaking subjects, while black subjects were run by black high school counselors and athletic coaches. In St. Louis black subjects were run by a black counselor from NASCO, Inc. Thus, in all but the college student sample, subjects were run by older persons of the same sex and race as the subjects.

All administrators were trained in standard procedures by the second author. Subjects were paid $2.00 per hour for filling out the questionnaires, and for administrative purposes, names were taken. The subjects were assured that their answers would in no way affect their lives and that they would remain anonymous to the principal investigator.

Subjects were tested in small groups of 5-10 at a time, during the evenings or weekends for high school students, and during the day for college

students and unemployed blacks. The administrators first explained the purpose and goals of the study in their own words, as given by an introduction sheet written by the investigators. The need for truthful answers was stressed as was the investigator's hope that the results of the study would be socially relevant. The administrators then read the instructions to the subjects, asked for questions, and explained any unclear points. The practice sheet was then administered and evaluated, and some subjects who could not understand the task were paid for their time and excused. If any questions arose during administration as to the meanings of words, answers were given according to a sheet of "standard definitions" prepared by the investigators.

Results

Tucker's (1966) three-mode factor analysis was chosen as the most appropriate analytic method. The three "modes" were, of course, role pairs, behavioral items, and individuals (N = 89, due to subject attrition and incomplete questionnaires).

Two important aspects of this procedure should be mentioned: (1) the variance in cell modes is considered common variance, i.e., no unique or specific factors are specified; (2) all cross-product matrices were found in full; no approximations were used.[5]

Table 2 presents the rotated factor matrix for the behavioral items; Table 3 presents the loadings of each role-pair stimulus on the role factors. These may be interpreted in the same manner as other principal-component solutions. Table 4 presents the three-mode "core matrix," showing the inter-relationships of the item, role pair and subject factors.

[5]Because the three-mode analysis is rather complex, space limitations prevent a complete exposition of the technique here. The reader is referred to Levin (1968) for a clear explanation of the logic of the method, and to Tucker (1966) for a technical reference which should allow the interested investigator to perform his own three-mode analyses.

Rotation procedures were based on the "raw" varimax criterion (Harman, 1968) and the Harris-Kaiser (1964) method which generally results in oblique solutions with respect to the principal components. (This obliqueness is reflected in the "factor intercorrelation matrices" presented in the Results section; actual Pearson r's between the factors, based on subjects' factor scores, are generally much lower.) The final rotation on the core matrix was performed as outlined in Tucker (1966).

The cross-products matrix was chosen for the analysis because it allows for mean differences in response magnitude to be reflected in the results of the analyses. These mean differences were of interest to the investigators in interpreting between-groups differences in perception.

Table 2

Behavioral Item Factors

Items	1	2	3	4	5
Admire	-.064	.121	-.075	.479*	-.056
Ask permission of	.108	-.159	.104	.464*	-.080
Fight with	.512*	-.008	-.067	.120	-.056
Love	-.021	.038	-.133	.456*	.033
Take orders from	.117	-.222*	.314*	.353*	-.052
Work together	-.097	.064	.378*	.158	.100
Call him (her) Mr. (Mrs.)	-.032	-.008	.756*	-.035	.025
Threaten	.389*	.195	.128	-.078	-.046
Discipline	.126	.435*	.224	-.042	-.110
Argue with	.404*	.205	.017	.017	-.051
Laugh together	-.038	.129	.071	.137	.214*
Invite to home	.010	.081	-.157	.179	.275*
Tell personal problems to	.143	-.117	-.121	.189	.266*
Hit	.528*	-.077	-.101	-.049	.143
Treat as a brother	.096	-.173	.128	-.083	.477*
Play games with (cards, pool, etc.)	-.007	.012	.053	-.060	.466*
Relax with	-.043	.062	-.011	-.020	.438*
Invite out to lunch	-.065	.204*	-.022	-.009	.325*
Give orders to	.059	.580*	-.024	-.067	.003
Show affection	-.217*	.425*	-.080	.264*	.036

NOTE: All loadings rounded to third decimal.

* High loadings.

1. Hostility
2. Superordination with affection
3. Subordination (formal)
4. Subordination with affection
5. Friendship

Table 3

Role-Pair Factors

		I	II	III	IV	V
Father-son (in house)	1	0.059	0.045	0.013	-0.056	0.267*
Mother-son (in house)	2	-0.011	0.064	0.014	-0.037	0.299*
Father-daughter (in house)	3	0.023	0.048	0.019	-0.047	0.288*
Mother-daughter (in house)	4	0.012	0.070	0.026	-0.050	0.278*
Husband-wife (in house)	5	0.042	0.032	0.144*	-0.063	0.179*
Wife-husband (in house)	6	0.037	0.006	0.246*	-0.061	0.088
Son-father (in house)	7	-0.001	0.059	0.256*	-0.068	0.039
Daughter-father (in house)	8	0.002	0.053	0.275*	-0.055	-0.000
Son-mother (in house)	9	0.003	0.045	0.272*	-0.050	0.008
Daughter-mother (house)	10	0.016	0.054	0.274*	-0.075	0.032
Uncle-nephew (house)	11	-0.003	0.111	0.038	-0.025	0.158*
Cousin-cousin (house)	12	-0.014	0.061	0.123*	0.005	0.070
Nephew-uncle (house)	13	-0.030	0.085	0.146*	0.009	0.023
W. foreman-w. worker (work)	14	-0.046	0.194*	-0.074	0.023	0.109
W. foreman-b. worker (work)	15	0.058	0.156*	-0.048	-0.008	0.045
B. foreman-w. worker (work)	16	0.049	0.157*	-0.054	0.008	0.039
B. foreman-b. worker (work)	17	-0.021	0.218*	-0.046	0.009	0.037
B. cop-w. cop (work)	18	-0.014	0.184*	0.030	0.003	-0.022
W. cop-b. cop (work)	19	0.008	0.182*	-0.017	0.007	0.008
W. worker-w. foreman (work)	20	-0.045	0.166*	0.091	0.042	-0.090
W. worker-b. foreman (work)	21	0.055	0.111*	0.076	0.023	-0.095
B. worker-w. foreman (work)	22	0.064	0.111*	0.110	0.012	-0.134*
B. worker-b. foreman (work)	23	-0.026	0.178*	0.102	0.020	-0.114
B. civil rights leader-b. citizen (work)	24	-0.084	0.212*	-0.004	0.007	0.087
W. worker-b. worker (work)	25	0.082	0.115*	-0.001	0.002	0.011
B. worker-w. worker (work)	26	0.089	0.092	0.025	0.005	-0.007
B. citizen-b. civil rights leader (work)	27	-0.054	0.200*	-0.051	0.021	0.096
B. teacher-b. student (city hall)	28	0.032	0.186*	-0.087	-0.013	0.101
B. teacher-w. student (city hall)	29	0.083	0.137*	-0.077	-0.012	0.091
W. teacher-b. student (city hall)	30	-0.027	0.181*	-0.081	0.037	0.105

Table 3 (Continued)

		I	II	III	IV	V
W. teacher-w. student (city hall)	31	0.019	0.175*	-0.039	0.009	0.048
B. policeman-b. man (city hall)	32	-0.020	0.192*	-0.046	0.029	0.044
W. policeman-w. man (city hall)	33	-0.072	0.201*	0.086	0.041	-0.099
B. student-b. teacher (city hall)	34	0.069	0.138*	0.111	-0.007	-0.130
B. student-w. teacher (city hall)	35	0.034	0.165*	0.077	0.017	0.136*
W. student-b. teacher (city hall)	36	-0.012	0.179*	0.096	0.017	-0.105
W. student-w. teacher (city hall)	37	0.211*	0.046	0.029	-0.047	-0.013
w. revolutionary-b. man (city hall)	38	0.054	0.125*	0.034	0.008	-0.033
W. civil rights worker-b. man (city hall)	39	-0.020	0.101*	0.075	0.057	-0.011
W. neighbor-b. neighbor (city hall)	40	0.114*	0.078	0.035	0.006	-0.025
b. neighbor-w. neighbor (city hall)	41	0.063	0.142*	0.037	-0.016	-0.024
B. man-w. revolutionary (city hall)	42	0.179*	0.055	0.028	-0.027	-0.026
B. man-w. civil rights leader (city hall)	43	0.067	0.130*	0.044	0.003	-0.059
W. police-b. man (city hall)	44	0.146*	0.132*	-0.067	-0.037	0.052
W. police-b. demonstrator (city hall)	45	0.230*	0.049	-0.058	-0.033	0.065
B. police-w. man (city hall)	46	0.060	0.140*	-0.067	0.031	0.027
B. man-w. police (city hall)	47	0.156*	0.094	0.086	-0.032	-0.096
B. demonstrator-w. police (city hall)	48	0.267*	0.037	0.060	-0.071	-0.048
W. revolutionary-b. peddler (city hall)	49	0.166*	0.077	-0.011	-0.036	0.028
B. militant-w. man (city hall)	50	0.284*	0.029	0.002	-0.053	-0.001

Table 3 (Continued)

		I	II	III	IV	V
B. civil rights demonstrator-w. segregationist demonstrator (city hall)	51	0.257*	0.057	0.014	-0.074	-0.003
B. peddler-w. revolutionary (city hall)	52	0.145*	0.083	0.028	-0.019	-0.036
Father-son (at park)	53	0.009	-0.045	0.050	0.054	0.243*
Mother-son (at park)	54	-0.005	-0.057	0.063	0.053	0.264
Father-daughter (at park)	55	-0.007	-0.058	0.055	0.081	0.221*
Mother-daughter (at park)	56	-0.014	-0.061	0.060	0.074	0.230*
Husband-wife (at park)	57	-0.014	-0.059	0.157*	0.056	0.144*
Wife-husband (at park)	58	0.005	-0.085	0.194*	0.062	0.114
Son-father (at park)	59	-0.031	-0.062	0.257*	0.085	-0.008
Daughter-father (at park)	60	0.016	-0.063	0.267*	0.040	0.011
Son-mother (at park)	61	0.001	-0.076	0.241*	0.066	0.035
Daughter-mother (at park)	62	-0.018	-0.092	0.260*	0.077	0.033
Uncle-nephew (at park)	63	-0.035	-0.042	0.023	0.121*	0.173*
Cousin-cousin (at park)	64	-0.039	-0.007	0.064	0.111*	0.099
Nephew-uncle (at park)	65	-0.058	-0.029	0.156*	0.125*	0.014
W. foreman-w. worker (party)	66	-0.057	0.027	-0.027	0.180*	0.045
W. foreman-b. worker (party)	67	0.012	0.026	-0.072	0.159*	0.043
B. foreman-w. worker (party)	68	0.004	0.008	-0.045	0.191*	-0.003
B. foreman-b. worker (party)	69	-0.050	0.044	-0.035	0.176*	0.028
B. police-w. police (party)	70	-0.026	0.019	-0.006	0.170*	-0.015
W. cop-b. cop (party)	71	0.001	0.006	-0.023	0.167*	0.024
W. worker-w. foreman (party)	72	-0.058	0.050	0.012	0.177*	-0.028
W. worker-b. foreman (party)	73	0.035	-0.015	0.016	0.177*	-0.051
B. worker-w. foreman (party)	74	0.027	0.019	0.026	0.165*	-0.083
B. worker-b. foreman (party)	75	-0.088	0.058	0.044	0.175*	-0.049
B. civil rights leader-b. citizen (party)	76	-0.075	0.087	-0.023	0.162*	0.009

Table 3 (Continued)

		I	II	III	IV	V
W. worker-b. worker (party)	77	0.047	-0.039	0.022	0.161	-0.025
B. worker-w. worker (party)	78	0.028	-0.033	0.013	0.181*	-0.027
B. citizen-b. civil rights leader (party)	79	-0.057	0.048	0.055	0.149*	-0.037
B. teacher-b. student (park)	80	-0.086	0.106	-0.066	0.135*	0.085
B. teacher-w. student (park)	81	0.037	0.030	-0.064	0.134*	0.059
W. teacher-b. student (park)	82	0.032	-0.011	-0.069	0.161*	0.068
W. teacher-w. student (park)	83	-0.026	0.060	-0.047	0.127*	0.072
B. police-b. man (park)	84	-0.009	0.056	-0.074	0.145*	0.049
W. cop-w. man (park)	85	-0.007	0.029	-0.046	0.162*	0.034
B. student-b. teacher (park)	86	-0.058	0.055	0.060	0.160*	-0.070
B. student-w. teacher (park)	87	0.025	0.015	0.041	0.163*	-0.101
W. student-b. teacher (park)	88	0.022	0.040	0.063	0.136*	-0.105
W. student-w. teacher (park)	89	-0.067	0.050	0.063	0.178*	-0.086
W. revolutionary-b. man (park)	90	0.167*	-0.047	-0.009	0.093	0.011
W. civil rights leader-b. man (park)	91	0.071	-0.022	-0.006	0.132*	0.011
W. neighbor-b. neighbor (park)	92	0.058	-0.012	-0.014	0.145*	0.011
B. neighbor-w. neighbor (park)	93	0.047	-0.025	0.007	0.145*	-0.010
B. man-w. revolutionary (park)	94	0.168*	-0.066	0.010	0.112*	-0.026
B. man-white civil rights leader (park)	95	0.094	-0.031	0.008	0.145*	-0.036
W. cop-b. man (park)	96	0.121	-0.019	-0.062	0.107	0.060
W. cop-b. demonstrator (park)	97	0.241*	-0.069	-0.071	0.059	0.095
B. cop-w. man (park)	98	0.028	0.012	-0.062	0.179*	0.005
B. man-w. police (park)	99	0.129	-0.052	0.029	0.124*	-0.045

Table 3 (Continued)

		I	II	III	IV	V
B. demonstrator-w. cop (park)	100	0.262	-0.074	0.041	0.022	-0.018
W. revolutionary-b. peddler (park)	101	0.134	-0.067	-0.016	0.127*	0.014
B. militant-w. man (park)	102	0.252*	-0.103*	-0.015	0.077	0.023
B. civil rights demonstrator-w. segregationist demonstrator (park)	103	0.253*	-0.078	-0.042	0.073	0.037
B. peddler-w. revolutionary (park)	104	0.138	-0.077	0.033	0.131*	0.040

NOTE: All loadings rounded to third decimal.

* High loadings

I. Interracial Conflict Roles
II. Secondary Group Roles-Formal Situations
III. Ingroup -- Low → High or Equal Status
IV. Outgroup Roles and Secondary Group -- Informal and Public Situations
V. Ingroup Superior → Subordinate and High → Low Status

Table 4

Core Matrix

Subject Factors	Stimulus (Role-Pair) Factors	Behavior Item Factors: Hostility	Superordination and Affection	Subordination (Formal)	Subordination & Affection	Friendship-Equality
1	1	-234.51	-277.57	-104.50	-249.40	-342.25
	2	-364.29	-360.51	-227.49	-377.25*	-492.24*
	3	-309.49	-292.52	-234.26	-396.48*	-377.20
	4	-386.79*	-409.15*	-211.29	-431.95*	-521.48*
	5	-249.40	-224.84	-186.44	-307.32	-306.34
2	1	14.67	16.21	0.68*	19.74	23.00
	2	23.19	22.49	12.36*	24.22*	53.07*
	3	9.26*	2.51*	4.23*	25.24*	25.76*
	4	36.85*	23.15	10.67	25.91*	51.17*
	5	10.36*	-1.29*	-14.68*	22.98	24.40*
3	1	-5.44*	2.22	7.75*	0.36	-4.11*
	2	-4.61*	0.16	-0.43	3.28*	-6.09*
	3	8.66*	2.33	3.72*	-12.98*	4.81*
	4	-1.01	.76	-1.23	0.49	-11.85*
	5	.34	2.55*	0.75	-16.12*	3.47*
4	1	-11.74*	-12.93*	4.03	-4.25	-2.53
	2	5.22	-10.99*	9.54	-11.63*	-3.94
	3	10.53*	-7.11	2.47	-6.46	-1.63
	4	-2.01	-12.56*	14.78*	-8.84	-9.98
	5	2.51	-3.49	4.42	-10.71*	-3.40
5	1	6.66	4.45	-1.09	2.97	-1.53
	2	8.56*	1.72	2.63	0.87	-4.08*
	3	7.65*	-3.82	-2.33	6.44	4.75
	4	2.39	-2.52	1.11	-0.26	6.61
	5	1.03	4.16	10.85*	8.82*	-0.35

NOTE: All loadings rounded to second decimal.

*Extreme loadings

The core matrix may be interpreted as follows: A subject factor represents an "idealized individual"--that is, an abstract person who loads maximally on the first subject factor and 0 on all others. Each idealized individual is represented by a matrix, the rows of which correspond to stimulus factors, and the columns of which represent item factors. The numbers in the matrix show how that "idealized individual" responds to each stimulus factor in terms of each item factor. A high number (relative to the others in that row) means that that "idealized person" sees stimuli loading on that factor as high in the quality represented by that item factor (in this specific case, as having behaviors represented on that item factor directed toward the second role pair member with high frequency).

Table 5 shows how each of our demographically distinct samples scores in relation to the idealized individuals. A discriminant analysis was performed using the factor loadings on the subject factors (idealized individuals) as dependent variables. The results (see Table 5) show how each subset of the subject sample loads on each subject factor, and thus which point of view is characteristic of that sample.

The following pages present the investigators' interpretation of the tables above--essentially, a brief verbal description of the structure of role perceptions in our sample.

Five role pair factors were obtained:

1. Interracial conflict roles
2. Secondary group roles, formal situations
3. Ingroup roles, low to high status
4. Secondary group roles, informal and public situations
5. Ingroup roles, high to low status.

(See Table 3 for role pairs loading on these factors.)

Table 5

Discriminant Analysis on Subject-Factor Loadings

(Three-Mode) by Demographic Groups--Role Perceptions

Group Means on Original Factor Loadings

Group	Factor 1	2	3	4	5
White college girls	-164.15	26.29	3.65	-1.04	9.02
White high school & Spanish	-164.12	29.11	-1.87	-2.03	1.12
Black high school	-193.97	- 4.82	-2.51	6.36	-6.62
Black hardcore	-190.97	-29.87	1.15	-3.89	- .21

Scaled Vectors of Discriminant Functions

Factors	Function 1	Function 2
1	81.36	-97.92
2	193.66	75.24
3	5.00	-47.58
4	5.35	86.63
5	66.14	-104.08
% of variance	88.32	10.35

Group Means on Discriminant Functions

Group	Function 1	Function 2
White college girls	-34.71	74.05
White high school & Spanish	-35.76	80.77
Black high school	-77.95	92.20
Black hardcore	-95.30	72.88

Overall F ratio = 6.37 (df = 15,224) $p < .01$

Five behavioral item factors were also obtained:

1. Hostility
2. Superordination with affection
3. Formal subordination
4. Subordination with affection
5. Friendship

(For specific items defining these factors, see Table 2).

The core matrix (Table 4) shows the five points of view which characterized our subject population. Table 5 shows which groups of subjects are associated with which point of view. The investigators interpreted these tables as follows:

Whites see more Friendship and more Subordination with Affection than do blacks, particularly hardcore blacks, in all five role types. Whites also see more Hostility and Superordination with Affection in secondary group roles than do blacks, especially the hardcore. A minority of blacks, however, present a point of view similar to that described for whites above (as seen by the mean group loadings on Subject Factor 1, Table 5).

The white college girls see more Hostility and less Friendship in secondary group roles than do the black high school boys. A minority of the black high school boys present another view; this is characterized by high Hostility in Ingroup Low to High Status roles and low Hostility in Interracial Conflict roles. These boys are also characterized by low Superordination with Affection for Interracial Conflict roles and Secondary group roles of both types.

One interpretation of this factor is that it represents high school boys whose families engage in frequent and extreme fighting, thus shifting the level of adaptation concerning hostility in roles, when compared with other groups of subjects. These boys see relatively little conflict in Interracial Conflict roles, because relative to their level of adaptation the conflict in these roles is rather minor.

Discussion

The original focus of the present study was to contrast the social perceptions of a group of hardcore unemployed with several other groups. The results, however, may contain implications broader than this. The extent to which they generalize to other black samples will be explored in our next study. This study is only exploratory and it must be remembered that we have employed very special samples. The high school boys were judged by school authorities to be socially maladjusted. The hardcore have had a history of job difficulties. Thus, all the blacks in this study were defined by the establishment as "problem people." The contrasting group of white middle-class girls was not judged to have such characteristics.

Table 6 presents a summary of the differences in role perception found among the black and white subjects sampled. There emerged among both the black and white Ss a predominant (or majority) point of view and a less common (or minority) point of view. The predominant black and white points of view are represented by viewpoint 2, in the three-mode analysis and are shown first; they can be summarized as follows: These particular blacks view ingroup low to high status roles, such as son-father, daughter-father, son-mother, daughter-mother, etc., as involving superordination with affection (both give orders to and show affection for), formal subordination (call him Mr., take orders from) and hostility (fight with, argue with,

threaten). By contrast, the whites of this point of view see friendship (laugh together, tell personal problems to, play games with, relax with), and subordination with affection (admire, love, take orders from) as appropriate. A second point of view, which is prevalent but not the most frequent, is listed second. It involves certain white subjects who see only formal subordination in such roles. A minority of blacks see subordination with affection as appropriate. Thus, if we assume that lack of hostility in such relationships is desirable, we can oversimplify the findings by talking about "good" and "bad" family relationships. The data suggest that there are both kinds of relationships in both subcultural groups. However, the frequency of "bad" family relationships is higher in black than in white role perceptions.

What is meant by "bad" family relationships, from one prespective, may not be bad from another. James Savage (personal communication) points out that from his point of view, as a black psychologist, our interpretation is wrong. He states: "Many black parents encourage their kids to vent their hostility on them instead of channeling it into the community, where racist cops wait with guns and tanks." In short, what is "bad" to white psychologists, may be functional and "good."

Another possible interpretation of these findings is that economic disadvantages are translated by children into hostility to parents. Such disadvantages are likely to lead to frustrations, which if unchecked and uncompensated, may be translated into aggression. Further research is needed to explore such opposing interpretations.

The ingroup high to low relationships, such as father-son, mother-son, father-daughter and mother-daughter, show a similar pattern of results. The majority of blacks show formal subordination (take orders from, work together),

Table 6

Summary of Black and White Differences in Role Perceptions

III (Ingroup) Low-High	V (Ingroup) High-Low	IV Secondary Informal, Public	II Secondary Formal Situations	I Interracial Conflict	
		BLACKS			
Super. Affect. Subord. Formal Hostility	Subord. Formal Super. Affect. Hostility	Subord. Formal	Subord. Formal	Subord. Formal	Dominant Viewpoint
		Friendship Subord. Affect. Super. Affect.	Friendship		Prevalent Viewpoint
Subord. Affect.	Subord. Affect.	Friendship	Friendship Hostility	Hostility Friendship	Minority Viewpoint
		WHITES			
Friendship Subord. Affect.	Friendship	Friendship Hostility	Friendship Subord. Affect.		Dominant Viewpoint
Subord. Formal	Subord. Formal Hostility Super. Affect.	Subord. Formal	Subord. Formal	Subord. Formal Hostility	Prevalent Viewpoint
Hostility Subord. Formal	Friendship Super. Affect.		Subord. Affect.	Subord. Formal	Minority Viewpoint

superordination with affection (discipline, give orders to, show affection to) and hostility (fight with, hit, argue with); the majority of whites show friendship (play games with, relax with). A second point of view involves certain whites who see formal subordination, hostility and superordination with affection in such roles, just as do blacks. A third point of view consists of the minority of blacks who see subordination with affection (admire, love), while a minority of whites see both friendship and superordination with affection (discipline, give orders to, show affection to) in such roles.

A comparison of the low-to-high status with the high-to-low status ingroup roles would suggest that, although both types of roles have "problems," the low-to-high have somewhat larger problems. This may reflect the age of our subjects, who are definitely sons but rarely fathers.

It is also interesting to note that family roles do not change character when we move from private to public situations. This is not true of other kinds of roles, which do change in different social contexts.

We turn now to those roles that we called secondary in informal and public situations, such as foreman-worker at a party, worker-foreman at a party, white policeman-black policeman, civil rights leader-citizen at a party, black worker-white worker at a party, black policeman-white man at the park, etc. The black majority in our samples sees formal subordination (call him Mr.) as appropriate; the white majority sees both friendship (play games with, treat him as a brother, relax with) and hostility (fight with, argue with, threaten) as appropriate, a viewpoint suggestive of a kidding relationship. A prevalent black point of view is characterized by friendship, subordination with affection (admire, ask permission of) and superordination with affection (give orders to, invite to lunch, show affection

to), while a prevalent white viewpoint involves mere formal subordination (call him Mr.). Finally, a black minority sees friendship as appropriate in such roles.

Roles in formal situations, such as civil rights leader-citizen at work, teacher-student at city hall, policeman-man at city hall, etc., are seen by the black majority as requiring formal subordination (call him Mr.) while the white majority still sees friendship and subordination with affection as appropriate. A secondary black point of view sees friendship and a white point of view formal subordination as appropriate in such roles. Finally, a minority of blacks see both friendship and hostility as appropriate while the corresponding whites see subordination with affection as suitable in such roles.

It is notable that the combination of friendship and hostility can imply a kind of kidding relationship, which is appropriate among intimates. Whites see such relationships in informal roles, but blacks do not. On the other hand, a minority of blacks seems to react to formal situation roles in such a way.

Finally, in roles involving interracial conflict, such as black demonstrator-white policeman, black militant-white man, etc., the prevaling black point of view is that formal subordination is appropriate, but not much more; a minority sees both hostility and friendship as appropriate. The whites do not have a dominant viewpoint, but a prevalent one suggests that both formal subordination and hostility are appropriate and a minority view considers only formal subordination as appropriate in such roles.

If we examine the total pattern of findings, and we assume that the ordering of role types, from ingroup to interracial conflict represents an underlying dimension of goal similarity to goal dissimilarity, we can observe the following patterns:

1. The majority of blacks in our samples responds with ambivalence in ingroup roles, and seems to react rather negatively to all types of roles. According to this viewpoint, the definition of the ingroup is narrow since it does not include other kinds of roles, such as secondary roles in informal situations. By contrast the majority of whites show friendship in a wide band of role types, and exclude only interracial conflict roles from this mode of responding. In addition, the whites appear to employ the combination friendship-hostility, which suggests a kidding relationship, with more intimate roles, while the blacks show it rarely and if so, only in formal roles.

2. An important viewpoint, but not that of the majority of either group reflects friendship toward secondary role persons in the black sample, and formal subordination towards all types of people in the white. The white sample of this viewpoint appears to be very stiff and cold while the black is quite friendly.

3. The minority of blacks in our samples shows a pattern or both subordination and affection in the ingroup, friendship in secondary groups, and kidding relationships in the interracial conflict situations. This is the black point of view which is most similar to the white viewpoint, and is more prevalent among the high school subjects than among the hardcore. A minority of whites shows hostility in the ingroup and formal subordination in outgroup situations.

To summarize, one interpretation of our findings is that the pattern of discrimination experienced by blacks in this country results in psychic traumata manifested in unusually negative interpersonal relationships, ambivalence in such relationships even in ingroup roles, and a narrow definition of the ingroup. By contrast the majority whites employ broad

definitions of the ingroup, positive interpersonal relationships and show less ambivalence. Some blacks escape from this pattern and have role perceptions that are similar to those of whites.

Implications for Training in Black-White Job Settings

If we assume, as we did with justifications presented in Triandis, Feldman and Harvey (1970), that supervisor-subordinate roles evolve from appropriate family roles, the ingroup low-to-high status roles are basic to understanding subordinate-supervisor roles; the ingroup high-to-low are basic to understanding supervisor-subordinate roles.

The majority of the blacks in our sample see much more hostility in ingroup low-to-high status roles than do the whites. Furthermore, the ingroup high-to-low relationships seen by the majority of blacks also reflect a good deal of hostility (fight with, hit, argue with). Thus, both sets of data would suggest the perception of ingroup roles that are more tense and argumentative in the black samples than in the white samples. This phenomenon should produce greater difficulties in the interactions of a white or black foreman with black subordinates, than in the interaction of such foremen with white subordinates.

Training here might involve warning the foreman that black subordinates might be more argumentative, and putting this argumentativeness in perspective for him. One could point out to him, for instance, that arguing is sometimes used as a form of entertainment, a way to spend time and amuse oneself. Loud argument is not necessarily as tense an experience as middle-class people tend to believe. Similarly, the blacks might be told that foremen are not used to loud arguments, and "even if you are dissatisfied with one of their decisions, they expect you to present your views in a calm, logical and low-key manner."

The perception of secondary roles, such as foreman-worker is particularly relevant here. We find the majority of blacks adopting a rather distant viewpoint. The majority whites, on the other hand, adopt a kidding relationship which is basically friendly, but appears superficially argumentative. It would be desirable for blacks to learn this type of kidding relationship, but the task of learning might be very difficult. Let us not forget that basically the majority of the blacks sampled here have been hurt by whites too much to feel positive about them; in fact, they are likely to feel quite negative. Since the kidding relationship a assumes the existence of a positive interpersonal feeling, it may be unrealistic to hope that blacks can carry out this behavior pattern without first changing their feelings about whites. It is probable that a formal relationship will "protect" both sides from showing their true feelings and aggravating the situation. Only after long experience in interaction with similar goals, will the two groups feel comfortable with each other, at which time they might naturally adopt the kidding relationship, which seems to be valued in industrial shops. From the point of view of training, it may be best to explain to both sides that particular behavioral patterns (formal, kidding) might be found in the shop, and urge them to adopt them only when they feel comfortable with each other. In the meantime, they may be encouraged to behave formally.

A final point about friendship between black and white workers, is that blacks have difficulties interpreting white friendly behavior. Is the behavior due to compliance to government regulations or company policy, or does it truly reflect their attitudes and values? In short, here is a case where behavior is less important than attitude. The black wants to know the causes of the white's friendly behavior. Unfortunately, we know next to

nothing about how people discriminate between compliance and internalization (to use Kelman's distinction) in another person. Further research is needed on this fundamental problem of social perception, before we can teach blacks the cues which reveal a white's attitudes. It should be pointed out, also, that the converse phenomenon is also of importance: whites do want to know if a cooperating black is cooperating because he must or because he wants to. The kinds of attributions made by foremen when they react to workers' cooperative behavior may have important implications for recommendations concerning raises, promotions, etc. An important area of investigation is suggested by these points.

References

Banton, M. Roles. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Biddle, B. J., & Thomas, E. J. Role theory: Concepts and research. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Harman, H. Modern factor analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Harris, C. W., & Kaiser, H. F. Oblique factor analytic solutions by orthogonal transformations. Psychometrika, 1964, 29, 347-362.

Kelman, H. D. Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of opinion change. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1958, 2, 51-60.

Levin, J. Three-mode factor analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 64, 442-452.

Linton, R. The study of man. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1936.

Sarbin, T. R. Role theory. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. (1st ed.) Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954, 223-258.

Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. Role theory. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), Handbook of social psychology. (2nd ed.) Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968, 488-568.

Triandis, H. C., Feldman, J. M., & Harvey, W. M. Person perception among black and white adolescents and the hardcore unemployed. Report No. 5, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5-02. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., & Malpass, P. S. Field guide for the study of aspects of subjective culture. Report No. 4, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5-02. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., McGuire, H., Saral, T., Yang, K., Loh, W., & Vassiliou, V. A cross-cultural study of role perceptions. In H. Triandis, V. Vassiliou, Y. Tanaka, and A. Shanmugam (Eds.), The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., & Nassiakou, M. Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement. 1968, 8, No. 4, 1-42.

Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., Tanaka, Y., & Shanmugam, A. V. The analysis of subjective culture. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Tucker, L. R. Some mathematical notes on three-mode factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1966, 31, 279-311.

Werner, O., & Campbell, D. T. Translating, working through interpreters and the problem of decentering. In P. Naroll and R. Cohen (Eds.), A handbook of method in cultural anthropology. New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1970.